

REMARKS

In the action of June 22, 2010, the examiner objected to the drawings; objected to the disclosure; objected to claims 12 and 17; rejected claims 1-7 under 35 USC § 103 as unpatentable over Adamsson in view of Urbush; and rejected claims 8-17 under 35 USC § 102 as anticipated by Davies.

First, the amendments to the drawings and specification should be noted. A substitute specification is enclosed which addresses the examiner's suggestion with respect to format. No new matter is included. Withdrawal of the rejections is now respectfully requested.

Further, claim 17 has been amended (claim 12 has been cancelled) in response to the examiner's objection. Withdrawal of the objection is now respectfully requested.

Still further, Figures 7 and 8 have been added, in response to the examiner's objections. No new matter is included.

Claim 1 has been amended to more specifically set forth the height of the rim portion. The height is substantially at least one-half the height of the tallest bristles, but lower than the top of the bristles. The cited reference to Adamsson discloses a rim member which is significantly less than one-half the height of the bristles. With such a configuration, it would be impossible to accomplish the specific function of applicant's invention, which is to direct/produce movement of fluid from the bristles as the bristles move toward the teeth during operation of the brushhead. Since claim 1 now defines a structure which is substantially different in both structure and function relative to Adamsson, claim 1 defines patentable subject matter relative to the cited references.

Claim 8 has been amended so that it now specifies at least two paddle members, which are continuous, and extend for substantially the length of the bristle field. The bristle field extends entirely around the paddle member. Applicant's invention, is designed to direct fluid from the bristles toward the teeth, as opposed to producing a polishing or direct cleansing effect, as is the case with Davies. None of the two paddle embodiments of Davies show paddle members which are continuous and which run substantially the length of the bristle members and where the bristle field extends entirely around the paddle members. These characteristics of

applicant's structure are all directed toward accomplishing a specific function, which is to direct fluid from the bristles toward the teeth to produce increased cleansing, as opposed to a polishing or whitening effect produced by the "wall elements 6" of Davies. Accordingly, claim 8 is patentable over Davies.

Also note amended claim 14 in which the two paddle members are sufficiently different in configuration or material that they move out of phase with each other during movement of the brushhead. There is no difference in configuration between the paddle members in the Davies embodiments which use at least two paddles. Also note claims 16 and 17 which set forth "wing portions", which extend outwardly from the paddle member, or which are located at opposing ends of the paddle members. The examiner's reference to "crenellations" refer to "battlement members", which extend upwardly from walls, such as castle walls. This structure would have no effect on direction of fluid. Hence, claims 16 and 17 are independently patentable over Davies.

Allowance of the application is now respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

JENSEN & PUNTIGAM, P.S.

By Clark A. Puntigam
Clark A. Puntigam, #25763
Attorney for Applicant